

EPAUnited States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460**Work Assignment**

Work Assignment Number

2-35

☐ Other☐ Amendment Number:

Contract Number

EP-W-10-002

Contract Period 11/19/2009 To 11/18/2014

Base

Option Period Number 2

Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name

Eval. of Ocean Dumping Program

Contractor

INDUSTRIAL ECONOMICS, INCORPORATED

Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW

Pg. 10-11, Element 3, Sec. 1, para 1

Purpose:



Work Assignment



Work Assignment Close-Out



Work Assignment Amendment



Incremental Funding



Work Plan Approval

Period of Performance

From 11/19/2011 To 11/18/2012

Comments:

The purpose of this action is to initiate Phase 2 of Eval. of Ocean Dumping Program. The contractor shall start Work Assignment 2-3a on November 19, 2011.



Superfund

Accounting and Appropriations Data



Non-Superfund

SFO
(Max 2)

Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A.

| Line | DCN (Max 6) | Budget/Y (Max 4) | Appropriation Code (Max 6) | Budget Org/Code (Max 7) | Program Element (Max 9) | Object Class (Max 4) | Amount (Dollars) | (Cents) | Site/Project (Max 6) | Cost Org/Code (Max 7) |
|------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |

Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling

Contract Period:

Cost/Fee:

LOF

11/19/2009 To 11/18/2014

This Action:

Total:

Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals

Contractor WP Dated:

Cost/Fee:

LOF:

Cumulative Approved:

Cost/Fee:

LOE:

Work Assignment Manager Name Matt Keene

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number 202-566-2240

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Project Officer Name Cathy Turner

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number: 202-566-3951

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Other Agency Official Name

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number:

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Contracting Official Name Jami Rodgers

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number: 202-564-4781

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Work Assignment Statement of Work

Title: Measuring the Effectiveness of the Ocean Dumping Management Program

Contractor: IEc, Inc.

Contract No.: EP-W-10-002

Work Assignment Number: 2-35

Phase 2:

Estimated Period of Performance: November 19, 2011 to November 2012

Key EPA Personnel:

Work Assignment COR (WA COR):

Matt Keene
Office of Policy
U.S. EPA
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20460
202.566.2240 (phone)
202.566.2200 (fax)
Mail Code (1807T)
Keene.matt@epa.gov

Contract Level COR:

Cathy Turner
CMG/OP (1805T)
202/566-0951
202/566-3001 (fax)

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

Located within the Office of Policy (OP)'s Office of Strategic Environmental Management is the Evaluation Support Division (ESD). ESD's mission is to build the capacity of EPA staff and managers to conduct program evaluation activities throughout the Agency by providing technical support and training on program evaluation for EPA's national programs and regional offices. A crucial component in assessing the benefit of meeting goals, objectives, and sub-objectives is having measurable results.

As part of its effort to encourage the effective use of program evaluations throughout the Agency, ESD promotes program evaluation through a Program Evaluation Competition (PEC or Competition). This Competition is part of an ongoing, long-term effort to help build the capacity of headquarters and regional offices to evaluate activities and to improve measures of program performance. This program evaluation project was chosen for support under the current Program Evaluation Competition sponsored by OP.

In 1972, Congress enacted the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA, also known as the Ocean Dumping Act) to prohibit the dumping of material into the ocean that would unreasonably degrade or endanger human health or the marine environment. The MPRSA

implements the requirements of the London Convention, which is the international treaty governing ocean dumping. EPA's ocean dumping management program regulates ocean dumping to protect the environment from any material that will degrade or endanger human health, welfare, or amenities, or the marine environment, ecological systems, or economic potentialities.

Ocean dumping cannot occur unless a permit is issued under the MPRSA. Certain materials, such as high-level radioactive waste, medical waste, sewage sludge, and industrial waste, are banned from dumping in the ocean. In the case of dredged material, the decision to issue a permit is made by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), using EPA's environmental criteria and subject to EPA's concurrence. EPA's ocean dumping criteria consider the environmental impact of the dumping; the need for the dumping; the effect of the dumping on esthetic, recreational, or economic values; and the adverse effects of the dumping on other uses of the ocean. With regard to concurrence on USACE-issued permits, EPA must conduct an independent evaluation of the sediments to be ocean dumped and can provide conditions in its concurrence. EPA works closely with USACE to ensure that dredged material proposed for ocean dumping is sampled and tested correctly, and that test results are evaluated correctly and show that material is suitable for ocean dumping. EPA develops and revises testing guidance for this process.

For all other materials, EPA is the permitting agency. EPA is also responsible for designating recommended ocean dumping sites for all types of materials. All EPA-designated ocean dredged material disposal sites must have a site management plan including, among other things, the monitoring and management of the site. The criteria and procedures for ocean dumping permits and for the designation of ocean dumping sites can be found in EPA's ocean dumping regulations at 40 CFR Parts 220 to 229. EPA has issued General Permits under the MPRSA for burial at sea of human remains, transportation and disposal of vessels, and disposal of man-made ice piers in Antarctica.

EPA's Office of Water administers the Ocean Dumping Management Program in coordination with the seven EPA Regions with ocean programs (Regions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, and 10). In addition to disposal of dredged material, fish waste, vessel, and human remains, the ocean dumping program regularly addresses public and other agency inquiries related to dumping or placement of material in the ocean (e.g., space junk/rockets, nerve gas and other wastes abandoned after WWI and WWII, use of refuse-derived fuel, wastes from America's Cup racing yachts, ocean fertilization and marine geo-engineering activities).

We propose to evaluate the effectiveness of the Ocean Dumping Management Program in preventing marine pollution from ocean dumping and placement of materials, and to determine whether EPA's marine pollution funds are accomplishing their intended purpose. The evaluation will provide information to ensure that available resources are utilized in the most effective manner, are aligned with the degree of risk, and deliver the highest return in terms of environmental benefits.

This is an appropriate time to evaluate the Ocean Dumping Management Program's effectiveness for six reasons.

First, a clean and healthy ocean is important for all Americans. Executive Order #13547 establishing the National Ocean Policy states "the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes provide jobs, food, energy resources, ecological services, recreation, and tourism opportunities, and play

critical roles in our Nation's transportation, economy, and trade, as well as the global mobility of our Armed Forces and the maintenance of international peace and security." An effectively managed ocean dumping program is not only essential in protecting public health and the environment, but critical to the marine transportation system and the economy. The program is a key component in achieving the Agency's goal of 95% of achieving environmentally acceptable conditions (as reflected in each site's management plan and measured through on-site monitoring programs) at active dredged material ocean dumping sites (Target Measure SP-20, Goal 2, Sub-objective 2.2.2., EPA's FY 2011-2015 Strategic Plan).

Second, after almost 40 years since the passage of the MPRSA, it is appropriate to step back and review the program's accomplishments, challenges, and future directions. Before 1972, many potentially harmful materials were ocean dumped, including industrial waste, sewage sludge, radioactive waste, demolition waste, and contaminated dredged material. The program initially focused on evaluating historic disposal sites and designating new ocean disposal sites for dredged material. Dumping of sewage sludge and industrial waste were also large components of the program prior to their ban. Today, virtually all material ocean dumped is uncontaminated dredged material (sediment) removed from the bottom of waterbodies to maintain navigation channels and berthing areas. Regional ocean dumping programs continue to focus on dredged material disposal, including site designations and management of sites, as well as vessel, fish waste, human remains, and emergency issues. For example, since 2009, the disposal of vessels in Alaska and the Caribbean required extensive coordination between EPA, Regions and other federal agencies. In addition, the ocean dumping program regularly evaluates inquiries from the public and other agencies to determine if proposals to place/dump material in the ocean would be subject to the MPRSA and permissible. Recently, marine activities to mitigate climate change impacts or influence (e.g., ocean fertilization and marine geo-engineering activities) have been the subject of intense regulatory focus internationally, and the ocean dumping program has played a key role in developing guidance on how such proposals should be evaluated.

Because the ocean dumping program has not undergone a systematic evaluation outside OW since 1972, this evaluation will help EPA to obtain essential information on the program's effectiveness to determine whether EPA's marine pollution funds are accomplishing their intended purpose. In FY2011, \$13.59 million and 44.1 FTE were requested in the President's Budget to ensure marine ecosystems protection by controlling point-source and vessel discharges, managing dredged material and ocean dumping, developing regional and international collaboration, and monitoring ocean and coastal waters, and managing other marine issues, such as marine debris and invasive species. The ocean dumping management program includes FTE at HQ and in seven Regions, extramural funds for the Regions (\$568,000), Region 2 helicopter (\$253,000), and OSV Bold used to conduct site designation and monitoring surveys.

Third, EPA is responsible for the designation of ocean disposal sites. This includes baseline surveys, EIS development, public participation, and formal site designation in the Federal Register. Currently, approximately 10 sites are in the process of being designated or expanded. EPA's role in reviewing and concurring (with conditions) for all dredged material permits is a major component in ensuring that the sites are not degraded. As part of site management, EPA Regions also conduct assessment surveys to assess specific resources that may be at risk due to dumping (such as coral), and routine periodic site monitoring to document trends of environmental impacts due to dredged material disposal.

Fourth, the U.S. has signed and has been working toward ratification of the 1996 London Protocol for several years. The 1996 Protocol is on the Administration's Treaty Priority List for the 111th Congress. The Protocol updates, significantly improves, and is intended to eventually replace the 1972 London Convention. Of note, sequestration of CO₂ under the seabed is regulated internationally under the London Protocol. In June 2008 following four interagency reviews, the Administration submitted proposed implementing legislation for the 1996 London Protocol (changes to Title I of the MPRSA). EPA is currently reviewing the 2008 amendments package to consider any updates/changes prior to re-submittal to the Hill from the Obama Administration. This evaluation would not only help determine the effectiveness of the ocean dumping program but also provide a baseline for conducting a comparison of program implementation before and after any amendments to the MPRSA to implement the London Protocol.

Fifth, the Agency's FY 2011 enacted operating plan guidance directing office of Water to prepare a study on the feasibility of reduction to funding or elimination of the OSV Bold. The Agency is currently conducting an evaluation of the costs of this important asset, as well as the full range of benefits it provides to our oceans and coastal program. An overall Ocean Dumping Program Management program evaluation would provide recommendations on utilizing alternative approaches to achieve program goals and fulfill the Agency's mission with reduced program funding. Results would provide information to EPA senior managers to support policy changes and budget redirection. Findings and recommendations would be utilized to improve the program's efficiency and effectiveness.

Transferability of results: The results of the evaluation study will be a key element in formulating and improving the existing ocean dumping program. Further, the results of the evaluation study will provide the catalyst for improving the existing guidance for site designation, monitoring, and permitting. Information from this evaluation will help EPA to develop guidance for the Regions on effective ways to meet MPRSA requirements. This program evaluation would also provide a baseline for conducting a comparison of program implementation before and after the MPRSA is amended.

Qualification Criteria for Personnel

The team assigned to this work assignment collectively must have expertise in the following areas:

- a. Conceptual modeling of programs, including logic modeling, theory of change, results chains, and other similar approaches to documenting and analyzing program theory
- b. Process evaluation
- c. Outcome evaluation
- d. Evaluation of EPA programs
- e. Qualitative data collection and analysis (e.g. interviews, focus groups, content analysis, data coding)
- f. Performance measurement
- g. Decision matrix method (optional)

Quality Assurance (QA) Requirements

Check [] Yes or [X] **NO**, if the following statement is true or false. The Contractor shall submit a written Quality Assurance Project Plan for any project that is developing environmental measurements or a Quality Assurance Supplement to the Quality Management Plan for any project which generates environmental data using models with their technical proposal.

TASKS AND DELIVERABLES:

The work assignment (WA) Contracting Officer Representative (COR) will review all deliverables in draft form and provide revisions and/or comments to the contractor. The contractor shall prepare the final deliverables incorporating the WA COR's comments.

Contractor personnel shall at all times identify themselves as Contractor employees and shall not present themselves as EPA employees. Furthermore, they shall not represent the views of the U.S. Government, EPA, or its employees. In addition, the Contractor shall not engage in inherently governmental activities, including but not limited to actual determination of EPA policy and preparation of documents on EPA letterhead.

PHASE 1 INCLUDES TASK 1 AND TASK 2-1 through 2-5)

TASK 1: PREPARE WORKPLAN

The contractor shall prepare a workplan that addresses Phase 1 and 2 within 15 calendar days of receipt of a work assignment signed by the Contracting Officer (CO). The workplan shall outline, describe and include the technical approach, resources, timeline and due dates for deliverables, a detailed cost estimate by task and a staffing plan. The WA COR and the Contract Level COR and the CO will review the workplan. However, only the CO can approve/disapprove the workplan. The contractor shall prepare a revised workplan incorporating the Contracting Officer's comments, if required.

Deliverables and Schedule Under Task 1

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| 1a. Workplan | Within 15 calendar days of receipt of work assignment. |
| 1b. Revised workplan | Within 5 calendar days of receipt of comments from the CO, if required. |

NOTE REGARDING WORK ASSIGNMENT DELIVERABLES AND TECHNICAL DIRECTION:

The Work Assignment Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) is authorized to issue technical direction (TD) under this work assignment. The COR will follow-up all oral technical direction in writing within 5 days.

TASK 2: DOCUMENT REVIEW AND DESIGN METHODOLOGY

[Contract Scope of Work Element III, Section 1, para(s) 1, page(s) (10 -11)]

2-1 PARTICIPATE IN A CONFERENCE CALL. The contractor shall participate in a

conference call with the WA COR and other Agency staff to clarify the purpose of the evaluation effort and to exchange ideas about the design of the assessment, the information to be collected, potential sources of information, appropriate ways to analyze and present the information, and other pertinent matters. The COR will contact the contractor and provide a time and date for the conference call. For the purposes of costing the contractor shall assume one two-hour conference call. Within 3 calendar days, the contractor shall deliver a summary (minutes) of the call.

- 2-2 REVIEW DOCUMENTS. The WA COR will provide the contractor with relevant links and essential documents to become familiar with the history, goals, and status of the program and each program activity to be considered. In addition, the contractor shall conduct a web based search to determine if any existing evaluations, studies or analysis of the program or similar programs, including internationally, have been conducted. The contractor is expected to seek out other documents for review, including those from government and non-government sources, to become familiar with all aspects of the program that are relevant to this evaluation effort. The contractor shall complete a review of these documents seven (7) calendar days after receiving them. The contractor shall also prepare and submit to the WA COR a bibliography, using a citation software (e.g. EndNote, Zotero) to be determined by the program, and summary of the findings from the document and literature review. The contractor shall revise and update the bibliography periodically as additional literature sources are identified and reviewed.
- 2-3 SCOPING TASK. The contractor shall conduct a scoping exercise to better understand and identify the data sources (qualitative and/or quantitative) and data collection methods (surveys, in-person interviews, site visits, data base review or literature review, Internet search, review of progress reports etc.) that are most appropriate for this evaluation. The contractor shall prepare a brief memo summarizing the results of this effort. The contractor shall deliver the scoping document 7 calendar days after receiving a TID from the WA COR.
- 2-4 ASSIST IN DEVELOPING A LOGIC MODEL. The development of a logic model is an essential tool in developing a common understanding of a program's inputs, outputs and activities. As an initial step in preparation for the evaluation, EPA began developing a program logic table (including comprehensive listings of program resources, activities, outputs and outcomes) and linking components of the table to draft a logic model. EPA will share these products with the contractor. To complete the logic table and logic model, the contractor shall consider the need, in coordination with the program office, to collect additional information (See Task 2-1) using, for instance, online survey instruments (e.g. survey monkey), interviews (phone, email) and/or focus groups as appropriate to ensure incorporation of perspectives beyond EPA HQ (e.g. EPA regions and partners). Based on information gathered from the conference calls (Task 2-1) and document review (Task 2-2), the contractor will develop and submit a draft logic model using software (e.g., Microsoft Word, Power Point) that can be easily manipulated/revised within 7 calendar days after receipt of the logic table and draft logic model from the WA COR. The development of the logic model is an iterative process and revisiting and adjusting the logic model may be necessary while refining the evaluation questions (Task 2-5). The contractor shall finalize the logic model within 7 calendar days after receipt of comments on draft(s) of the logic model from the WA COR.

- 2-5 **REFINE EVALUATION QUESTIONS.** EPA is providing an initial list of draft evaluation questions for use by the contractor (see below). The EPA evaluation team has identified the following key questions to provide focus to the program evaluation. These questions begin to clarify the purpose of the evaluation and will form the basis of the evaluation going forward; however, the questions below are broad and comprehensive. They require further refinement and sub-questions to focus the scale and scope of the evaluation and improve its utility. In addition to the questions included in this task, the program will provide a comprehensive list of related, detailed and general, questions that the contractor will sort and prioritize based on input from the program, information gathered in Tasks 2-1 and 2-2, and the logic model developed in Task 2-4. Using this refined list, the contractor shall confer with the WA COR and evaluation team members to refine and finalize the evaluation questions that will be the subject of this evaluation. The contractor shall prepare and submit to the WA COR a revised, comprehensive set of draft evaluations and sub-questions that will be the subject of this evaluation. The contractor shall finalize the draft questions 7 calendar days after receipt of comments from the WA COR via Technical Direction (TD).

Draft Evaluation Questions

1. What is this program's theory of change, including fundamental assumptions of and relationships between program goals and objectives, intended outcomes, outputs, activities, resources and resource deployment?
2. What are the key issues, challenges and opportunities for national and regional implementation of the program, especially related to improvement, innovation, emerging issues and guidance?
3. Given stable or reduced program resources, what are the opportunities for improving the alignment between resource deployment and the program's intended outcomes?
4. What metrics or assessment tools could be used to determine and measure the outcomes, including environmental outcomes, of the ocean dumping program?

- 2-6 **DESIGN EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.** Based on the conference calls (2-1), the document review (Task 2-2), the scoping document (Task 2-3), the final logic model (Task 2-4), and the final evaluation questions (Task 2-5), the contractor shall prepare a draft evaluation methodology, which will address the purpose, audiences and the refined questions that will be the focus of the evaluation. As part of the methodology, the contractor shall document what's needed to answer each evaluation question, including: primary and secondary data sources, collection methods, collection strategy, appropriate qualitative (including software such as NVivo9, Sensemaker, etc as appropriate) and quantitative tools (statistical software packages as appropriate) for analyzing data including specific approaches to coding data and information, practical issues of data collection, and a clear strategy and tools for data documentation and management. In terms of data management, the contractor shall establish transparency and data access protocols (i.e. how data is attributed to data source, who has access to data, how to access data). The contractor shall also document any survey instruments, survey data, survey questions, and interview/discussion guides and protocols used in support of the evaluation. This methodology shall include an approach for identifying potential

interviewees and/or respondents. Given all of the above considerations, the contractor shall, in the methodology, identify (and provide supporting evidence) appropriate approaches (e.g. written reports, webpages, visual/verbal briefings, emails, conference calls, webinars, video conferencing, etc) to communicating the evaluation process and results to the audiences most vested in the answers to these evaluation questions.

The draft evaluation methodology shall also include a proposed schedule for each of the following: (1) all information gathering under Task 3-1, including interviews; (2) the discussion of compilation, analysis and presentation of information gathered (Task 3-2) and (3) providing a report outline and the draft and final reports (Task 4-1, 4-2 and 4-3). The draft evaluation methodology shall be due **21** calendar days after the receipt of a TD from the WA COR. The final evaluation methodology will be due **7** calendar days after receipt of comments from the WA COR via TD.

- 2-7 **REPORT OUTLINE.** The contractor shall submit for discussion and agreement an annotated outline describing the purpose, titles, and intended contents of the chapters and sections of the final report. The outline shall also describe the planned length and style of the document. The outline shall be used as a reference by the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process and it shall be included in the methodology document. Any possible need to modify the outline shall be a discussion among the entire evaluation team.
- 2-8 **EVALUATION ASSURANCE PLAN.** The contractor shall prepare an evaluation assurance plan (EAP) that shall describe the use of primary and or secondary data sources for the evaluation report. Specifically, the EAP will describe: 1) the purpose of the evaluation, 2) the methodology used to collect data for the report, 3) how and where data for the evaluation was collected, 4) why the particular data collection method was chosen, 5) how the data will be used and by whom, 6) how the resulting evaluation report will be used and by whom and, 7) any data limitations or caveats. An example of an EAP will be provided by the COR. The contractor shall submit the EAP to the WA COR one week after the final evaluation methodology is approved. A final EAP will be delivered 3 calendar days after receipt of comments from the WA COR via TD.

Deliverables and Schedule Under Task 2

| | | |
|------|------------------------------|--|
| 2-1 | Participate in conference | To be specified by the WA COR |
| 2-2 | Summary of Document Review | 7 calendar days after receipt of documents |
| 2-3 | Scoping Memo | 7 calendar days after receipt of TD from WA COR |
| 2-4 | Finalize Logic Model | 7 calendar days after receipt of draft Logic Model from WA COR |
| 2-5a | Draft Refined Questions | 7 calendar days after final meeting with WA COR |
| 2-5b | Final Refined Questions | 7 calendar days after receipt of comments from WA COR via TD |
| 2-6a | Draft evaluation methodology | 21 calendar days after receipt of TD from WA COR |
| 2-6b | Final evaluation methodology | 7 calendar days after receipt of comments |

| | | |
|------|---------------------------|---|
| 2-7a | Evaluation Assurance Plan | via TD from WA COR 7 calendar days after COR approves final evaluation methodology |
| 2-7b | Evaluation Assurance Plan | 3 calendar days after receipt of comments via TD from WA COR |

PHASE 2: INCLUDES TASKS 2-6 through 2-8, TASKS 3 AND 4

TASK 3: INFORMATION GATHERING AND ANALYSIS

[Contract Scope of Work Element III, Section 1, para(s) 1, page(s) (10 -11)]

- 3-1 **INFORMATION GATHERING.** The information that is needed to conduct this evaluation will come from a variety of sources including the information identified collected in Task 2-3 and included in the final methodology 2-6b. Within 7 calendar days after the WA COR approves the evaluation methodology (via TD), the contractor shall begin the data collection process specified in the approved evaluation methodology. The data collection will end in accordance with the schedule included in the evaluation methodology.

Information and data gathered via the measures articulated in the evaluation methodology will be aggregated, analyzed and interpreted as stated in the methodology. For the purposes of costing, in addition to requirements for information gathering in Task 2, which will be integrated into data analysis and reporting, the contractor shall assume that subsequent interviews, focus groups and surveys will be required of groups and individuals associated with the program, including HQ program, HQ related offices, EPA Regions, USACE HQ and Districts, and National and Regional Dredging Team stakeholders. To reduce costs and environmental impact of implementing this contract, the contractor shall consider every opportunity to minimize the need for travel for data collection activities by integrating the use of online surveys (Survey Monkey), conference calls, online/video meetings and webinars (e.g. skype, GoTo meeting/webinar) and other software and approaches to communication that effectively facilitate collaboration (e.g. ThinkTank).

- 3-2 **DISCUSSION OF DATA COMPILATION, ANALYSIS, AND PRESENTATION.** In accordance with the evaluation methodology schedule, the contractor shall meet via conference call with the WA COR and other Agency staff to present and discuss approaches to and preliminary results of data compilation, analysis, and presentation of the information as previously agreed upon in the evaluation methodology. Prior to this call and for discussion during the call, the contractor shall provide the WA COR with a briefing memo that outlines preliminary findings for each evaluation question, overall preliminary learning/recommendations/conclusions.

Deliverables and Schedule Under Task 3

| | | |
|------|---|---|
| 3-2a | Discuss data compilation, analysis and presentation | In accordance with Methodology Schedule approved in Task 2-5b |
| 3-2b | Briefing memo of preliminary findings | In accordance with Methodology Schedule approved in Task 2-5b |

TASK 4: REPORTS

[Contract Scope of Work Element III, Section 1, para(s) 1, page(s) (10 -11)]

- 4-1 **REPORT OUTLINE.** The contractor shall submit an annotated outline describing the contents of the draft and final report. This will serve as a roadmap for laying out the format of the report. This will be instrumental in organizing the format and flow of the document and all subsequent reporting.
- 4-2 **DRAFT REPORTING.** In accordance with the evaluation methodology schedule, the contractor shall submit drafts of evaluation reporting (e.g. written documents, visual/verbal presentations, etc) products containing the compilation, analysis, and presentation of information developed and gathered during the evaluation process. For purposes of costing, the contractor shall assume that a sequence of a draft preliminary findings memorandum and two separate draft reports will be required.
- 4-3 **FINAL REPORT.** The contractor shall provide a final report that reflects appropriate consideration of the Agency's comments on the draft report and of any comments received during the oral presentations. The WA COR will provide the contractor with a copy of the ESD's Report Style Guidelines. These guidelines shall be used to write all components of the evaluation report. In addition, the contractor shall use the ESD Report Cover provided by the WA COR when preparing the final report.
- 4-3 **EVALUATION RECOMMENDATION TAXONOMY FORM.** The EPA will use this form to categorize each recommendation the contractor develops for the final report. The contractor shall complete the Evaluation Recommendation Taxonomy Form by providing each recommendation for the given evaluation, its proposed evaluation recommendation category, its direct environmental impact, and any additional comments the contractor may have. The list of the evaluation recommendation categories is located on the form for reference purposes. The WA COR will provide the contractor with a copy of the Evaluation Recommendation Taxonomy Form. The contractor shall complete the taxonomy form 3 calendar days after the final report is completed.
- 4-4 **ORAL PRESENTATIONS.** The contractor shall be prepared to make at least one oral presentation of the information at a date, time, and location to be specified by the WA COR in a TD. The contractor shall prepare appropriate briefing materials, specifically, a visual briefing (e.g. Prezi, PowerPoint, Zoho.Show, etc) for the oral presentation.
- 4-5 **FACTSHEET.** The contractor shall develop a fact sheet summarizing the evaluation purpose, questions, methodology, results and recommendations. The WA COR will provide the contractor with a copy of a fact sheet template 7 calendar days after completion of the Final Report.

Deliverables and Schedule Under Task 4

- | | | |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 4-1 | Report Outline | In accordance with the evaluation methodology schedule approved by the COR in task 2-5b. |
|-----|----------------|--|

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|--|
| 4-2 | Draft report | In accordance with the evaluation methodology schedule approved by the COR in task 2-5b. |
| 4-3 | Final report | 14 calendar days after receipt of comments on the draft report and oral presentations. |
| 4-4 | Evaluation Recommendation Taxonomy | 3 calendar days after the final report is completed. |
| 4-5 | Oral presentation | To be scheduled by the WA COR |
| 4-6 | Fact Sheet | 7 calendar days after completion of Final Report |

Table 1: Summary of Deliverables and Dates

| Task | Deliverable | Due Date |
|--|--|--|
| Task 1 Prepare Work plan | | |
| 1a | Work plan | Within 15 calendar days of receipt of work assignment |
| 1b | Revised work plan | Within 5 calendar days of receipt of comments from CO |
| Task 2 Document Review and Design Methodology | | |
| 2-1 | Participate in conference calls | To be specified by the WA COR |
| 2-2 | Review of Documents/Bibliography, summary of findings | 7 calendar days after receipt of documents |
| 2-3 | Scoping Memo | 7 calendar days after receipt of TD |
| 2-4 | Finalize Logic Model | 7 calendar days after receipt of draft Logic Model from WA COR |
| 2-5a | Draft Refined Questions | 7 calendar days after receipt of TD from WA COR |
| 2-5b | Final Refined Questions | 7 calendar days after receipt of comments from WA COR via TD |
| 2-6a | Draft Methodology | 21 calendar days after receipt of TD from WA COR |
| 2-6b | Final Methodology | 7 calendar days after receipt of comments from WA COR |
| 2-7a | Draft Evaluation Assurance Plan | 7 calendar days after WA COR approves final evaluation methodology |
| 2-7b | Final Evaluation Assurance Plan | 3 days after receipt of comments from WA COR via TD |
| Task 3 Information Gathering and Analysis | | |
| 3-2 | Discussion of Data Compilation, Analysis and Presentation Plan | In accordance with Methodology Schedule approved in Task 2-5b |
| Task 4 Report | | |
| 4-1 | Report Outline | In accordance with Methodology Schedule approved in Task 2-5b |
| 4-2 | Draft Report | In accordance with Methodology Schedule approved in Task 2-5b |
| 4-3 | Final Report | 14 calendar days after receipt of comments on Draft Report from WA COR |
| 4-4 | Evaluation Recommendation Taxonomy Form | 3 calendar days after completion of the Final Report |
| 4-5 | Oral Presentations | To be scheduled by the WA COR |
| 4-6 | Fact Sheet | 7 calendar days after completion of Final Report |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------|---------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC 20460 Work Assignment | | Work Assignment Number 2-35 | | | | | | | | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment Number | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Number EP-W-10-002 | Contract Period 11/19/2009 To 11/18/2014 Base Option Period Number 2 | Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name Eval. of Ocean Dumping Program | | | | | | | | |
| Contractor INDUSTRIAL ECONOMICS, INCORPORATED | | Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW Pg. 10-11, Element 3, Sec. 1, para 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Purpose: <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Close Out <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Incremental Funding <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work Plan Approval | | Period of Performance From 11/19/2011 To 11/18/2012 | | | | | | | | |
| Comments The purpose of this action is to Work Assignment 2-35 is to approve the Contractor's work plan and cost estimate dated October 11, 2011 for 806 hours level of effort, (b)(4) in costs, (b)(4) in fee with a ceiling of \$81,970.63. | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Superfund | | Accounting and Appropriations Data | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Superfund | | | | | | | | | | |
| SFO (Max 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Line | DCN (Max 6) | Budget/FY (Max 4) | Appropriation Code (Max 6) | Budget Org/Code (Max 7) | Program Element (Max 9) | Object Class (Max 4) | Amount (Dollars) | (Cents) | Site/Project (Max 6) | Cost Org/Code (Max 7) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Period 11/19/2009 To 11/18/2014 | | Cost/Fee: \$0.00 | | LOE | | | | | | |
| This Action | | \$81,970.63 | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | \$81,970.63 | | | | | | | | |
| Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contractor WP Dated: 10/11/2011 | | Cost/Fee: \$81,970.63 | | LOE 806 | | | | | | |
| Cumulative Approved | | Cost/Fee: \$81,970.63 | | LOE 806 | | | | | | |
| Work Assignment Manager Name: Matt Keene _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 202-566-2240 FAX Number: | | | | |
| Project Officer Name: Cathy Turner _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 202-566-0951 FAX Number: | | | | |
| Other Agency Official Name: _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: FAX Number: | | | | |
| Contracting Official Name: Jam Rodgers _____ (Signature) (Date) | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: Phone Number: 202-564-4781 FAX Number: | | | | |

EPAUnited States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460**Work Assignment**

Work Assignment Number

2-35

☐

Other

☐

Amendment Number

Contract Number

EP-W-10-002

Contract Period 11/19/2009 To 11/18/2014

Base

Option Period Number 2

Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name

Eval. of Ocean Dumping Program

Contractor

INDUSTRIAL ECONOMICS, INCORPORATED

Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW

Pg. 10-11, Element 3, Sec. 1, para 1

Purpose

☐

Work Assignment

☐

Work Assignment Close-Out

☐

Work Assignment Amendment

☐

Incremental Funding

☒

Work Plan Approval

Period of Performance

From 11/19/2011 To 11/18/2012

Comments:

The purpose of this action under Work Assignment 2-35 is to approve the Contractor's revised work plan budget dated December 28, 2011 for 933 hours level of effort, (b)(4) in costs, (b)(4) in fee with a ceiling of \$96,370.63.

☐

Superfund

Accounting and Appropriations Data

☒

Non-Superfund

SFO
(Max 2)☐

Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A

| Line | DCN (Max 6) | Budget/FY (Max 4) | Appropriation Code (Max 6) | Budget Org/Code (Max 7) | Program Element (Max 9) | Object Class (Max 4) | Amount (Dollars) | (Cents) | Site/Project (Max 8) | Cost Org/Code (Max 7) |
|------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |

Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling

Contract Period:

11/19/2009 To 11/18/2014

Cost/Fee

\$0.00

LOE

This Action

\$96,370.63

Total:

\$96,370.63

Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals

Contractor WP Dated

12/28/2011

Cost/Fee:

\$96,370.63

LOE: 933

Cumulative Approved:

Cost/Fee:

\$96,370.63

LOE: 933

Work Assignment Manager Name Matt Keene

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number 202-566-2240

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Project Officer Name Cathy Turner

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number: 202-566-0951

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Other Agency Official Name

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number:

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

Contracting Official Name Jami Rodgers

Branch/Mail Code:

Phone Number: 202-566-4781

FAX Number:

(Signature)

(Date)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC 20460 Work Assignment | | Work Assignment Number 2-35 | | | | | | | | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment Number: | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Number EP-W-10-002 | Contract Period 11/19/2009 To 09/19/2014 Base Option Period Number 2 | Title of Work Assignment/SF Site Name Eval. of Ocean Dumping Program | | | | | | | | |
| Contractor INDUSTRIAL ECONOMICS, INCORPORATED | | Specify Section and paragraph of Contract SOW Pg. 10 11, Element 3, Sec. 1, para 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Purpose: <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Close-Out <input type="checkbox"/> Work Assignment Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Incremental Funding <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work Plan Approval | | Period of Performance From 11/19/2011 To 9/19/2012 | | | | | | | | |
| Comments: The purpose of this action to Work Assignment (WA) 2-35 is to approve the contractor's revised budget estimate dated October 24, 2012 for Option Year 2 with an estimated cost of (b)(4) fixed fee of (b)(4) for a ceiling of 64,863.68, and 593.6 level of effort hours for this WA. | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Superfund | | Accounting and Appropriations Data | | | | | | | | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Superfund | | | | | | | | |
| SFO (Max 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Note: To report additional accounting and appropriations data use EPA Form 1900-69A | | | | | | | | | | |
| Line | DCN (Max 6) | Budget/FY (Max 4) | Appropriation Code (Max 6) | Budget Org/Code (Max 7) | Program Element (Max 9) | Object Class (Max 4) | Amount (Dollars) | (Cents) | Site/Project (Max 8) | Cost Org/Code (Max 7) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authorized Work Assignment Ceiling | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contract Period | | Cost/Fee | | LOE | | | | | | |
| 11/19/2009 To 09/19/2014 | | | | | | | | | | |
| This Action: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work Plan / Cost Estimate Approvals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contractor WP Dated | | 10/24/2012 | | Cost/Fee: | | \$64,863.68 | | LOE: 594 | | |
| Cumulative Approved: | | | | Cost/Fee: | | \$64,863.68 | | LOE: 594 | | |
| Work Assignment Manager Name Matt Keene | | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | |
| _____ (Signature) | | | | | | | | _____ (Date) | | |
| | | | | | | | | Phone Number 202 566-2240 | | |
| | | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | |
| Project Officer Name Cathy Turner | | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | |
| _____ (Signature) | | | | | | | | _____ (Date) | | |
| | | | | | | | | Phone Number 202 566-0951 | | |
| | | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | |
| Other Agency Official Name | | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | |
| _____ (Signature) | | | | | | | | _____ (Date) | | |
| | | | | | | | | Phone Number: | | |
| | | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | |
| Contracting Official Name Jeff Rodgers | | | | | | | | Branch/Mail Code: | | |
| _____ (Signature) | | | | | | | | _____ (Date) | | |
| | | | | | | | | Phone Number 202-564-4781 | | |
| | | | | | | | | FAX Number: | | |